



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/080,495	02/22/2002	Pavel Koulik	16792-2	4693
7590	04/05/2006			
Clifford W. Browning Woodard, Emhardt, Naughton, Moriarty & McNett Bank One Center/Tower, Suite 3700 111 Monument Circle Indianapolis, IN 46204-5137			EXAMINER	
			CONLEY, SEAN EVERETT	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1744	
DATE MAILED: 04/05/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/080,495	KOULIK ET AL.
	Examiner Sean E. Conley	Art Unit 1744

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 27-48 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) 28-43 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 27 and 44-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 22 February 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of group II, claims 26-48 in the reply filed on August 15, 2005 is acknowledged. Applicant's election without traverse of species (i) directed to claims 27 and 44-48 in the reply filed on January 23, 2006 is acknowledged.

Response to Preliminary Amendment

2. The preliminary amendment filed on August 15, 2005 has been considered for examination. However, the amendment was non-compliant because the listing of claims submitted did not include withdrawn claims 1-25. Since claims 1-25 are still pending in this application they must be listed in future communications with the status identifier indicating that they are withdrawn.

Double Patenting

3. Claims 27 and 44-48 of this application conflict with claims 26 and 40-44 of Application No. 10/397,674. 37 CFR 1.78(b) provides that when two or more applications filed by the same applicant contain conflicting claims, elimination of such claims from all but one application may be required in the absence of good and sufficient reason for their retention during pendency in more than one application. Applicant is required to either cancel the conflicting claims from all but one application or maintain a clear line of demarcation between the applications. See MPEP § 822.

A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

4. Claims 27 and 44-48 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 26 and 40-44 of copending Application No. 10/397,674. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 44-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Specifically, claims 44-48 recite a "means for recording and checking the plasma parameters". The specification fails to provide the structure that represents the functionally language following the "means for" clause in the claims. Additionally, the terms and phrases used in the claims must find clear support or antecedent basis in the description so that the meaning of the terms in the claims may be ascertainable by reference to the description. One of ordinary skill in the art would not be able to make and/or use the invention since one cannot determine the structure of the "means for recording and checking" function of claims 44-48 in view of the applicant's specification. Therefore, the specification fails to provide adequate written description for the "means for" language of claims 44-48.

6. Claims 45-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The specification is not enabling for a "means for recording and checking the plasma parameters" that is further able to record and/or check the following limitations

of claims 45-48: a rising flank of the electric voltage; the amplitude and length of pulses as well as pause between pulses; the amplitude and frequency of acoustic vibrations emitted by the object to be treated; or the temperature of the object to be treated. One of ordinary skill in the art would not be able to make and/or use the invention of claims 45-48 in view of the applicant's specification since there is no enablement in the specification showing that the limitations of claims 45-48 are capabilities of the means for recording and/or checking the plasma parameters.

7. Claims 44-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 44-48, the applicant has failed to provide an adequate disclosure of the structure in the specification that is required to perform the function of the claims. One of ordinary skill in the art would understand what structure is required to perform the recited function of claims 44-48.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamazaki et al. (JP406093310A).

Yamazaki et al. disclose a device for the realization of a surface treatment process (producing fine metal particles from a metal solid) by creation of a plasma and

application of the plasma against the surface (ingot (1)). The device comprises plasma torches (3A to 3C) for generating a plasma and a vibration sensor (20) attached to the ingot (1) for measuring the vibration of the ingot (1). The sensed vibrations, which result from the vibration energy of the plasma torches, are used to control an arc-extinguishing period and the igniting period of the plasma torches (see figure 1 and the English abstract).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sean E. Conley whose telephone number is 571-272-8414. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gladys Corcoran can be reached on 571-272-1214. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

March 30, 2006

SEC

X. E.C.

Krisanne Jastrzab
KRISANNE JASTRZAB
PRIMARY EXAMINER